

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

The attached two sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1 and 2. These two sheets, which include Figs. 1 and 2, replace the original two sheets including Figs. 1 and 2.

In Figs. 1 and 2, the following labels have been added: resistor (4 occurrences), ammeter, battery sensor, voltmeter, evaluation unit, microprocessor, electrical consumer, and control unit. The label, "generator" has also been added to Fig. 1. In addition, the reference numeral "99" and a corresponding dashed box have been added to Figs. 1 and 2.

Attachments: Two Replacement Sheets
 Two Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 15-28 remain in the application. Claims 15-28 are subject to examination. Claims 15 and 24 have been amended.

Under the heading "Specification" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner required a new title.

The title has been changed to: "Battery Sensor And Method For Accurately Measuring Battery Parameters With A Low Power Drain".

Under the heading "Specification" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner required a new abstract.

A new abstract has been provided on a separate sheet.

Under the heading "Drawings" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings.

In Figs. 1 and 2, the following labels have been added: resistor (4 occurrences), ammeter, battery sensor, voltmeter, evaluation unit, microprocessor, electrical consumer, and control unit. The label, "generator"

has also been added to Fig. 1. In addition, the reference numeral "99" and a corresponding dashed box have each been added to Figs. 1 and 2.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 15-18 and 24 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,252,406 to Tegge et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 15 and 28 have been amended to specify that the second current values are more precise than the first current values. Support for the changes can be found by referring to page 4, lines 5-7 of the translated specification, for example. Additional support and explanation can be found by referring to the translated specification at page 14, line 24 through page 15, line 6 and at page 16, lines 1-21.

Tegge et al. do not teach that the second current values are more precise than the first current values. In fact, it is not really clear from Tegge et al. that second current values are even obtained when the microprocessor or computer 30 has been moved into an on state as a result of a comparison between a first current value and a threshold value.

Tegge et al. merely teach that:

the CPLD compares the measured current and voltage data with high and low limits, and when one of the limits is exceeded, a trigger signal is

issued on line 46 to awaken the computer 30 (column 3, line 66 through column 4, line 12); and

the trigger signal on line 46 is maintained for a time that is sufficient to enable the computer 30 to perform its “programmed computations” and perhaps to produce necessary warnings (column 4, lines 21-26).

Column 5, lines 3-22 of Tegge et al. also teach that the computer 30 is activated to make “computations” (lines 13 and 18).

The only teaching in Tegge et al. relates to computations that are performed when the computer is turned on due to the comparison between the measured data and the high and low limits.

There is absolutely no teaching that current measurements are taken again after the computer 30 has been turned on. Additionally, there is no teaching that current measurements are taken when the computer 30 is activated, which are more precise than the current measurements that were taken when the computer was in a switched off state.

Tegge et al. do not anticipate the invention as now defined by claims 15 and 28.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 19, 20, 25, and 26 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,252,406 to Tegge et al. in view of Published U.S. Patent application No. 2005/0168227 to Naddei under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if there were a suggestion to combine the teachings as alleged by the Examiner, the invention as defined by these rejected claims would not have been obtained for the reasons given above with regard to claim 15 and the teaching of Tegge et al.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 21-23, 27, and 28 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,252,406 to Tegge et al. in view of Published U.S. Patent application No. 2005/0168227 to Naddei and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,281,919 to Palanisamy under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if there were a suggestion to combine the teachings as alleged by the Examiner, the invention as defined by these rejected claims would not have been obtained for the reasons given above with regard to claims 15 and 28 and the teaching of Tegge et al.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 15 or claim 28. Claims 15 and 28 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the

art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 15 or claim 28.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 15-28 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Werner H. Stemer/
Werner H. Stemer
(Reg. No. 34,956)

MPW:cgm

September 5, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101